

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed on November 14, 2007 (herein referred to as "Office Action"), Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-30 are pending.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 7-11, 15-18, 21, 22, 24 and 25 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Peters et al. (U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0003926 A1) in view of McBride et al. (U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0114431 A1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a method for providing selected status announcements from a wireless telephone user to a caller. The method comprises, in pertinent part, "responsive to a particular caller identification associated with a particular caller, sending the incoming call to a voice mail system without alerting the user of the incoming call" (claim 1, lines 21-21). It was admitted in the Office Action, that "Peters does not particularly disclose wherein the incoming call is sent to a voice mail system without alerting the user of the incoming call" (Office Action, page 3, lines 15-16).

The Office Action alleged that McBride corrects the admitted deficiencies of Peters by allegedly showing "sending an incoming call to a voice [mail] system without alerting the user of the incoming call" (Office Action, page 3, lines 17-18). However, what was cited in McBride merely shows "[giving] a person with a telephone full control of their phone calls by providing . . . the ability to send unwanted calls directly to a Voice Mail system without causing the phone to ring" (McBride, ABSTRACT). In addition, McBride shows "a Caller Control System which is a software program designed to give any person with a telephone full control of their phone calls by providing, in addition to Caller I.D., a call blocking feature available to reroute calls made by people who **intentionally try to keep from being recognized on Caller I.D.**, and to send any unwanted calls directly to a voice mail system without causing the phone to ring" (McBride,

paragraph [0019], emphasis added). This feature of "intentionally [trying] to keep from being recognized on Caller I.D." as disclosed in McBride is the opposite of and teaches away from what is recited in claim 1, i.e., being "responsive to a particular caller identification associated with a particular caller" (claim 1, line 21). Thus, Peters and McBride, either combined together or taken individually, fail to teach or suggest each recitation of claim 1. For at least this reason, claim 1 distinguishes over Peters and McBride and is allowable.

Independent claims 21, 22 and 26 recite "responsive to a particular caller identification associated with a particular caller" recitations in a manner similar to claim 1. Thus, claims 21, 22, and 26 are considered allowable over Peters and McBride for at least the same reasons.

Dependent claims 2-20 and 27 depend from claim 1. Dependent claim 28 depends from claim 21. Dependent claims 23-25 and 2 depend from claim 22. Dependent claim 30 depends from claim 26. Therefore, claims 2-20 and 27, claim 28, claims 23-25 and 29, and claim 30 distinguish over Peters and McBride for at least the reasons discussed in regard to claims 1, 21, 22 and 26, respectively.

In addition, with regard to claims 5, 6 and 12, these claims were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Peters, in view of McBride and further in view of Rutledge (US 2002/0142756) (hereafter "Rutledge"). However, nothing was cited or found in Rutledge that corrects the deficiencies of Peters and McBride; therefore, for this additional reason, claims 5, 6 and 12 are allowable.

Further, claims 13, 14, 19, 20 and 23 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Peters, in view of McBride and further in view of Bremer (US 6,018,671) (hereafter "Bremer"). However, nothing was cited or found in Bremer that corrects the deficiencies of Peters and McBride; therefore, for this additional reason, claims 13, 14, 19, 20 and 23 are allowable.

In addition, claims 27-30 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Peters, in view of McBride and further in view of Brown (US 7,010,288) (hereafter "Brown").

However, nothing was cited or found in Brown that corrects the deficiencies of Peters and McBride; therefore, for this additional reason, claims 27-30 are allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-30 pending in the application are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

If there are any charges with respect to this response or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account 06-1130 maintained by Applicant's attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /John Leonard Young/
John Leonard Young
Registration No. 57,150

CANTOR COLBURN LLP
20 Church Street, 22nd Floor
Hartford, CT 06103
Telephone (404) 607-9991
Facsimile (404) 607-9981
Customer No. 36192
Date: February 7, 2008